

REMARKS

The Response, filed in response to the Office Action mailed June 16, 2006, is believed to address all issues raised in the Action. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority and the receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents.

Applicants also thank the Examiner has considered the references listed in the PTO SB 08 forms filed on June 19, 2006 and January 17, 2008.

Amendments

The specification is amended to correct the typographical error in the drawing of formula (1-A1) on page 14. The formula (1-A1) is an exemplary species of the formula (1-A) (*see* the description of the specification on page 14, line 8). The formula (1-A) shown on page 10 of the specification and examples of formula (1-A) shown on pages 17-22 clearly describe that the formula (1-A) contain a pyrazole group, not a pyrrole group.

Claims 1 and 3 are amended to incorporate the features of original claim 6 and further define the dye (4) of original claim 6 into the dye (4-A). Claims 1 and 3 each further recite "wherein each of the compounds represented by general formulas (1), (2), (3), and (4-A) comprises any one of a sulfo group, a carboxyl group and a phosphono group in the molecule." Support for the limitation may be found in the specification, for example in the third full paragraph on page 10, the first paragraph on page 29, the fourth full paragraph on page 59, and the third full paragraph on page 85. Support for the dye (4-A) may be found in the disclosure, for example, at page 80, lines 3-7 of the specification.

Claim 6 is canceled. Claim 9 is amended to correct multiple dependency.

No new matter is introduced and entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-10 are all the claims pending in the application.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith *et al.* (U.S. 6,962,949; “Smith”).

Without conceding or commenting on the rejection, solely in order to advance the prosecution, independent claims 1 and 3 are amended to incorporate the features of original claim 6, rendering the rejection moot.

Therefore, the rejection is not sustainable and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Yamanouchi *et al.* (US 2002/0107301; “Yamanouchi”).

Smith is relied upon to teach an inkjet ink composition comprising a water-soluble dye having an anionic dissociable group, water, water-soluble solvent, and a cationic polymer.

The Office admits that Smith fails to teach specific examples of the dyes. Yamanouchi is relied upon to cure the defects. The Office asserts that Yamanouchi teaches specific types of dyes having an anionic dissociable group, which have the similar chemical structures to those recited in claims 6 and 7.

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Yamanouchi is directed to a coloring composition which is suitable for water-based ink, which coloring composition contains a polymer latex and a coloring particulate dispersion including particulate composed of at least an oil-soluble dye and a hydrophobic organic solvent.

Neither of Smith or Yamanouchi, alone or in combination, teaches the water-soluble dye comprising at least one of compounds represented by general formulas (1), (2), (3), and (4-A) which comprises any one of sulfo group, a carboxyl group and a phosphono group in the molecule, as defined in currently presented claims 1 and 3.

Therefore, Smith and Yamanouchi, either alone or in combination, fails to teach all and every element of the subject matter defined in claims 1 or 3.

Applicants further respectfully submit that the subject matter defined in the currently presented claims exhibits the unexpectedly excellent properties, for example as an excellent ozone resistance and does not easily cause a blotting when wetted with water after a printing on a plain paper. See pages 112-113 of the specification.

It is believed that the rejection is not sustainable and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sunhee Lee/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 16, 2008

Sunhee Lee
Registration No. 53,892